L. Quintana, Esq. (SBN 157291) Gerald E. Sarte (SBN 177639) Quintana McConnin & Sarte LLP 450 B Street Suite 1430 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: 619.231.6655 Facsimile: 619.243.0080

Todd C. Atkins (SBN 208879) Atkins & Davidson, APC 450 B Street, Suite 1430 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: (619) 255-2380 Facsimile: (619) 231-4984

Attorneys for Plaintiff
Annette Greetis

# Service Control of Con

09 JUL 14 PM 2: 04

CLEFK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA



# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

# southern district of california JMA

Annette Greetis,

Plaintiff.

v.

National City Mortgage; National City Servicing; and all other claimants of whatsoever kind and character against real property commonly known as 28750 Canyon Road, Valley Center, CA 92082; APN 185-141-68-00; and DOES 1 through 100 inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.:

# COMPLAINT FOR

- 1. VIOLATION OF RESPA 12 U.S.C. §2605 et seq.
- 2. VIOLATION OF TRUTH-IN-LENDING ACT 15 U.S.C. §1601 et seq.
- 3. VIOLATION OF BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE 17200
- 4. NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION
- 5. FRAUD
- 6. RESCISSION
- 7. QUASI CONTRACT
- 8. DETERMINATION OF VALIDITY OF LIEN

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 

ORIGINAL

#### THE PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff Annette Greetis (hereinafter "Plaintiff" or "GREETIS") is and at all times mentioned herein was an individual, residing in the County of San Diego. Plaintiff is the owner of certain real property commonly known as 28750 Canyon Road, Valley Center, CA 92082; APN 185-141-68-00, County of San Diego (hereinafter "Subject Property").
- 2. Defendant National City Mortgage (hereinafter "National City" or "Originating Lender") is an entity, form unknown, with a principal place of business to be determined in discovery. National City is, and at all times mentioned was, doing business in the State of California and in the County of San Diego.
- 3. Defendant National City Servicing (hereinafter "NC Service" or "Service") is an entity, form unknown, with a principal place of business to be determined in discovery. NC Service is, and at all times mentioned was, doing business in the State of California and in the County of San Diego.
- 4. This action pertains to an alleged note, loan and security interest originated by National City Mortgage known as loan # 0004780460 (the "LOAN").
- 5. Plaintiff intends this action and this document to represent a formal complaint and also act as a "qualified written request." This Complaint contains Plaintiff's name, premises address, account numbers, and demands in connection with the subject LOAN as to each originating lender and each subsequent servicer:
  - a. that each lender, servicer, creditor or owner justify any legal right to service, own,
     be named "creditor" and provide proof that Defendants, and each of them in fact
     has ownership or other authority regarding the LOAN;
  - b. that each lender, servicer, creditor or owner provide Plaintiff an opportunity to inspect all the original Notes and Deeds relating to the LOAN;
  - c. that each lender, servicer, creditor or owner state and prove that it did not violate Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act ("RESPA") regarding the LOAN, or admit that it violated RESPA;
  - d. that each lender, servicer, creditor or owner identify each and every transfer or sale

11.

14 15

16 17

18

19 20

2122

23 24

25

26

2728

to others of any rights in the LOAN, the Subject Property or the Note, along with a copy of each notice provided to Plaintiff of such transfer or sale;

- e. that each lender, servicer, creditor or owner in possession of any Truth-in-Lending disclosure, settlement statement or HUD-1 provide a copy of the same to Plaintiff;
- f. that each lender, servicer, creditor or owner provide a copy of any notice of cancellation rights, notice of rescission rights, or correspondence or written document discussing cancellation rights or rescission rights to Plaintiff;
- g. that each lender, servicer, creditor or owner provide a complete list of all telephone logs, communications logs, and correspondence logs, as well as all recordings, documents and digital versions of the subject matter of these logs to Plaintiff;
- h. that each lender, servicer or creditor provide documentation and proof of ownership for all parties currently holding any ownership rights under the note relating to these LOAN, and provide an opportunity to inspect the original note and trust deed under which each lender, servicer or creditor claims any rights to receive payments.
- 6. Plaintiff is ignorant of the true names and capacities of Defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, and therefore sues these Defendants by such fictitious names. DOES 1-100 at all times relevant herein were employees and/or agents of Defendants and each of them. Plaintiff will designate each DOE Defendant and serve them with this Complaint when their true names and capacities have been ascertained. Plaintiff alleges that each of said Defendants designated as a DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the events and happenings herein referred to and caused or is responsible in some manner for the damages proximately caused hereby.
- 7. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all times mentioned herein all of Defendants acted in concert with the other Defendants named in this Complaint in the wrongful and improper activities alleged and, therefore, are responsible for the damages as alleged by Plaintiff. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all times mentioned herein each individual, employee and person named in this Complaint was the agent and/or employee of each of the remaining Defendants and/or Defendant Employers, and acted in concert for the purpose of injuring Plaintiff as alleged

7

5

9

10

1112

13

1415

16

17

18 19

20

2122

23

25

24

26

2728

herein.

- 8. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that at all times mentioned herein each Defendant and individual named in this Complaint was acting within the course and scope of that relationship. Plaintiff is further informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that each of Defendants herein gave consent to, ratified, and authorized the acts alleged herein to each of the remaining Defendants. Plaintiff is informed and believes that at all times mentioned herein, that all Defendants are liable for the actions of each of the individuals mentioned herein.
- 9. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all times mentioned herein, Defendants have pursued a common course of conduct, acted in concert with, and conspired with, each other, and have aided and abetted one another to accomplish the wrongs complained herein.

# **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

Plaintiff complains against Defendants herein and demands a trial by jury on all issues.

# JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 10. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 1331 under the following statutes: the Truth-in-Lending Act, 15 U.S.C. 1601 et seq. ("TILA") and RESPA 12 U.S.C. §2605 and 12 U.S.C. §2601 et seq.
- 11. In addition, this Court has supplemental jurisdiction over all state claims alleged herein pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.
- 12. Venue in this district is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C §1391(b) because Plaintiff resides in this district, Defendants do business in this district, the Subject Property is in this district, and all events in question took place in this district.

# FACTS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

13. At the request of National City and others, Plaintiff obtained loan #0004780460 from National City on or about August 8, 2006.

#### LOAN ORIGINATION

14. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the wrongful acts of Defendants include violations of federal and state law before the initiation of the LOAN as well as during the servicing

1213

14

1516

17

18

19

2021

22

23

24

2526

27

28

# period of the LOAN:

- a. Prior to the funding of the LOAN, National City represented to Plaintiff that very favorable loans, loan terms and interest rates were available to her;
- b. As a result, National City Mortgage and other Defendants convinced Plaintiff to refinance the Subject Property and to take out financing for that purpose with National City, the LOAN;
- c. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that National City and other Defendants knew or intended that Plaintiff receive a worse loan, and that the worse loan produced a higher commission for them because it was at a higher interest rate and subject to higher fees;
- d. Defendants represented that financing charges were low and refinancing would be available at any time without severe penalties, and that the loan, note, and payment obligations were affordable to Plaintiff.
- e. Plaintiff is further informed and believes that National City and Defendants knew or should have known that in the event of Plaintiff's inability to perform on the LOAN, prepayment penalties, commissions and other foreseeable charges to Plaintiff would constitute an additional payment stream to the benefit of Defendants.
- 15. Although National City and other persons made certain representations regarding the LOAN, in actuality, the LOAN was not as represented because among other things:
  - a. It was at a higher interest rate than what was represented;
  - b. The payments were higher than the payment as represented to and agreed upon by Plaintiff;
  - c. There was less equity in the Subject Property than represented;
  - d. There was less money available to Plaintiff than represented;
  - e. The LOAN subsequently became unaffordable for Plaintiff; and
  - f. Plaintiff was accordingly put into a mortgage all without Plaintiff's informed consent.

16.	Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff with the	ıe
proper disclos	sures required under federal and state law:	

- a. Defendants did not provide to Plaintiff a proper notice of right to cancel at the time of the transaction;
- b. Defendants did not provide to Plaintiff accurate disclosures of the costs of financing, the Annual Percentage Rate ("APR"), the payment obligations, or the type of loan at the time of the transaction;
- c. A "SAMPLE" Settlement Statement is documented, but it does not show essential numbers and has "SAMPLE" printed on all the signature lines. As such, it cannot qualify as a HUD-1 disclosure;
- d. Defendants did not provide to Plaintiff a proper notice of right to cancel subsequent to the time of the transaction;
- e. Defendants did not provide to Plaintiff accurate disclosures of the costs of financing, the APR, the payment obligations, or the type of loan subsequent to the time of the transaction; and
- f. Defendants charged excessive amounts to Plaintiff in conjunction with the loan origination including but not limited to:
  - Numerous disclosed fees and charges purporting to be reasonable and to reflect the actual costs and values of the same, but actually constituting profit lines to the Defendants;
  - ii. Excessive fees and prepayment penalties were not included in the calculation of the APR or in the disclosures to Plaintiff, and were disclosed in misleading fashion; and
  - iii. Other unknown and undisclosed fees, commissions, premiums and compensation.
- 17. Plaintiff is informed and believes Defendants took unfair advantage of Plaintiff because they knew Plaintiff trusted them and was susceptible to their undue influence:
  - a. Plaintiff is an elderly lady.

- 18. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants National City, NC Service and other Defendants received Qualified Written Requests regarding the LOAN from Plaintiff and failed to adequately respond to Plaintiff's requests for information, which would have enabled Plaintiff an opportunity to work out the LOAN:
  - a. Plaintiff has requested information from Servicer including sending a qualified written request, but Servicer has not responded, preventing Plaintiff from addressing and resolving this dispute.

#### LOAN SERVICING

- 19. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants National City, NC Service and other Defendants failed to fulfill their lawful obligations regarding servicing of the LOAN:
  - a. Servicer failed to provide notice of transfer of lending operations to a new entity and also imposed late fees within 60 days of transfer.
- 20. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants further took advantage of Plaintiff while Plaintiff made extensive efforts in good faith to resolve the disputed issues while Defendants sought to obtain information for debt collection purposes and to further exert influence over Plaintiff:
- 21. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes that National City, and other Defendants and/or their agents breached their duties of care to Plaintiff by, among other things, the following:
  - a. Defendants failed to provide a settlement statement and other essential documents to Plaintiff:
  - b. Defendants failed to complete a loan application;
  - c. Defendants did not provide a HUD-1 at the time of closing;
  - d. Defendants' agents originated the LOAN without reasonable review and analysis of Plaintiff's income;
  - e. Defendants' agents purported to establish a loan modification without reasonable review and analysis of Plaintiff's income;
  - f. The programs offered by National City was a stated income stated asset loan.

    Plaintiff is informed and believes that National City did not verify employement or

ask for business license or DBA ("doing business as"). The Account Executive for National City informed Plaintiff that she could refinance because the market was going up, and that she did not have to prove anything on the loan application; and

- g. A blank Form 1003 fails to list employment, assets or employer.
- 22. At the time the LOAN was executed, predatory lending behavior evidenced by Defendants includes, but is not limited to, the following:
  - a. Falsifying loan applications (particularly regarding income level);
  - b. Forging signatures on loan documents (such as required disclosures);
  - c. Paying off lower-income mortgages;
  - d. Engaging in abusive collection practices; and
  - e. National City's upper management told their account executive to instruct Broker to have one of his loan officers sign back of the Form 1003 and that National City would execute the LOAN. The LOAN was a stated income and stated asset loan offered by National City Mortgage according their lending guidelines.
- 23. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes that National City, and other Defendants and/or their agents willfully deceived Plaintiff by, among other things, the following:
  - a. Defendants provided a Good Faith Estimate ("GFE") with a date of July 3, 2006, and a "revised date" of August 8, 2006, which rendered the disclosure and date indecipherable to Plaintiff;
  - b. Defendants provided false and misleading documents and documents in a language that Defendants reasonably knew would be incomprehensible to Plaintiff;
  - c. Defendants represented that the interest rate would be less than be 6% when in fact it was greater than 7%;
  - d. Defendants provided loan payment examples as purported disclosures of payment obligations that were incomprehensible; and
  - e. Loan payment examples involved complicated extrapolation to calculate for the actual loan using a confusing table disclosure.
  - 24. Plaintiff notified National City and NC Service of the defects in the LOAN and of

27

Plaintiff's right and desire to rescind the LOAN.

- 25. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the loan securitization process has created a situation where no single entity has complete ownership of the LOAN, or even sufficient authority to negotiate a workout or modification to the LOAN. As a result the Originating Lender, unknown investors and one or more servicers all entered into servicing agreements with an entity that cannot speak for the LOAN. NC Service represented that it had the right and authority to foreclose on the Subject Property. Plaintiff is informed and believes that this representation was false because all of NC Service's rights regarding the LOAN are derivative of rights held by unknown investors whose rights are themselves dependent on the rights of the Originating Lender who perpetrated the initiation of the LOAN. Plaintiff is informed and believes that NC Service falsely, wrongfully, and either negligently or intentionally represented to Plaintiff and to others that it had authority to service, collect, negotiate, work-out, and foreclose the LOAN notwithstanding the deficiencies with the LOAN.
- 26. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the LOAN and related contracts contain conflicting terms that are not reasonably comprehensible by a consumer, possibly including but not limited to the Note, Addenda, Trust Deed, Rider(s), TILA, Estimated Settlement Statement(s), Final Settlement Statement(s), Escrow Instruction(s), all containing complicated and in many cases contradictory terms.
- 27. Plaintiff relied on the representations of National City and other Defendants as alleged herein because Plaintiff reasonably believed that Defendants are licensed banks, real estate agencies, and/or mortgage companies, and are fiduciaries of Plaintiff, owing Plaintiff duties of utmost care, loyalty, professionalism and to conduct all real estate transactions herein without violating any of the fiduciary duties owed to Plaintiff.
- 28. National City and other Defendants breached their fiduciary obligations owed to Plaintiff, were negligent, made negligent misrepresentations, intentional misrepresentations, breached their contract with Plaintiff, were professionally negligent and caused Plaintiff damages.
- 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes that NC Service and other Defendants purchased or otherwise acquired unknown rights and/or responsibilities relating to Plaintiff's LOAN from National

City at some date unknown to Plaintiff. All such rights and responsibilities depend on the rights of National City and are meaningless and unenforceable if the rights of National City are unenforceable.

- 30. Plaintiff is informed and believes that NC Service and/or any entity that owns any rights as to the LOAN, steps into the shoes of the Originating Lender, National City, with respect to the deficiencies in the loan documents as well as the failure to provide Plaintiff with suitable disclosures and contract terms. NC Service, and/or any entity that owns any rights as to the LOAN, cannot take any action on the LOAN that the Originating Lender would have been prevented from taking due to the deficiencies in the LOAN. Plaintiff is informed and believes that NC Service, and/or any entity that owns any rights as to the LOAN, is contractually liable for the deficiencies at the originating stage of the LOAN. NC Service is a necessary party to this action to resolve the respective interests of the parties over the Subject Property.
- 31. As a proximate result of Defendants' conduct as herein alleged, Plaintiff sustained damages, including monetary loss, medical expenses, emotional distress, loss of employment, loss of credit, loss of opportunities, attorney fees and costs, and other damages to be determined at trial. As a proximate result of Defendants' breach of duty and all other actions as alleged herein, Plaintiff has suffered severe emotional distress, mental anguish, harm, humiliation, embarrassment, and mental and physical pain and anguish, all to Plaintiff's damage in an amount to be established at trial.
  - 32. Plaintiff's damages included but are not limited to:
    - a. Excessive fees, charges, penalties and interest.
- 33. Each Defendant herein is responsible for the acts of other Defendants and their predecessors based on the doctrine of *respondeat superior*. Further, each Defendant herein is responsible for the acts of other Defendants because each Defendant negligently supervised the other Defendants and is therefore directly responsible for the acts of the other Defendants.
- 34. All Defendants are agents, employees and other fiduciaries of each other as set forth within. Each of the wrongful acts by Defendants against Plaintiff set forth within were done in the scope of employment. Defendants were acting as agents and employees and in the transaction of the business of the employment or agency when performing their wrongful actions. Defendants are therefore directly, jointly and severally liable to Plaintiff for the actions of National City, NC Service,

4

12

10

13 14

1516

18

19

17

20

2122

23

24

2526

27

28

the employees of said parties, and all other Defendants as set forth within.

35. The aforementioned conduct of Defendants was an intentional misrepresentation, deceit, or concealment of a material fact known to Defendants with the intention on the part of Defendants of thereby depriving Plaintiff of property or legal rights or otherwise causing injury, and was despicable conduct that subjected Plaintiff to a cruel and unjust hardship in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, so as to justify an award of exemplary and punitive damages, as well as attorney fees and costs.

# **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **VIOLATION OF RESPA 12 U.S.C. § 2605**

- 36. Plaintiff incorporates by this reference each and every allegation contained in all foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth in full herein.
- 37. Defendants National City, NC Service and other Defendants failed to adequately respond to Plaintiff's requests for information regarding the LOAN and for an opportunity to work out the LOAN.
- 38. Defendants National City, NC Service, and other Defendants failed to adequately respond to Plaintiff's Qualified Written Requests in violation of RESPA.
- 39. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants National City, and other Defendants violated RESPA at the origination of the LOAN in various ways including but not limited to the following:
  - a. A "SAMPLE" Settlement Statement is documented, but it does not show essential numbers and has "SAMPLE" printed on all the signature lines. As such, it cannot qualify as a HUD-1 disclosure.
- 40. As a proximate result of the negligent conduct of Defendants and their failures as herein alleged, Plaintiff sustained damages, including monetary loss, medical expenses, emotional distress, loss of employment, loss of credit, loss of opportunities, and other damages to be determined at trial. As a proximate result of Defendants' breach of duty and all other actions as alleged herein, Plaintiff has suffered severe emotional distress, mental anguish, harm, humiliation, embarrassment, and mental and physical pain and anguish, all to Plaintiff's damage in an amount to be established at

trial. Plaintiff seeks to recover all possible damages Plaintiff is entitled to recover pursuant to RESPA, including statutory and punitive damages if possible.

# SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

# VIOLATION OF TRUTH-IN-LENDING ACT 15 U.S.C. § 1601 et seq.

- 41. Plaintiff incorporates by this reference each and every allegation contained in all foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth in full herein.
- 42. All Defendants have fraudulently concealed facts upon which the existence of Plaintiff's claim for Negligent Misrepresentation is based, and as such, the statute of limitations is equitably tolled as to this Cause of Action.
- 43. This consumer credit transaction was subject to Plaintiff's right of rescission as described by 15 U.S.C. § 1635(a) and Regulation Z § 226.23 (12 C.F.R. § 226.23).
- 44. More particularly, the same Defendants violated 15 U.S.C. § 1635(a) and Regulation Z § 226.23(b) with regards to the purported Notice of Right to Cancel. As a consequence of this action, the Notice of Right to Cancel documentation furnished to Plaintiff to failed to:
  - a. Correctly identify the transaction;
  - b. Clearly and conspicuously disclose Plaintiff's right to rescind the transaction three days after delivery of all required disclosures;
  - c. Clearly and conspicuously disclose how to exercise the right to rescind the transaction, with a form for that purpose;
  - d. Clearly and conspicuously disclose the effects of rescission; and
  - e. Clearly and conspicuously disclose the date the rescission period expired.
- 45. Furthermore, Plaintiff is informed and believes that National City and NC Service violated TILA at the time of origination because, among other things:
  - a. The interest rate on the note and the Truth-in-Lending disclosure were deceptively presented and not consistent.
  - b. The APR was not correctly calculated.
  - c. The required payments to the lender were not fully disclosed.
  - 46. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants' violation of the provisions of law

27

8

6

11

12

13 14

1516

18

17

19 20

21

2223

24

2526

27

28

rendered the credit transaction null and void, invalidates Defendants' claimed interest in the Subject Property, and entitles Plaintiff to damages as proven at trial.

# THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

# **UNFAIR COMPETITION UNDER BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200**

- 47. Plaintiff incorporates by this reference each and every allegation set forth in all foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth in full herein.
- 48. Defendants have engaged in business practices that are unlawful, unfair and fraudulent.
- 49. Defendants' business practices are unlawful as the activities alleged herein, i.e. those described in the foregoing causes of action, are forbidden by law.
- 50. Defendants' business practices are unfair because they offend public policy, are immoral, unethical, oppressive, and substantially injurious to consumers. Defendants, with little to no regard to Plaintiff's financial condition, executed and serviced the LOAN. Simultaneously, Plaintiff was unaware that LOAN was unaffordable to Plaintiff given the oral representations to the contrary made by Defendants, as well as the volume, complexity and incomprehensible nature of LOAN documents provided by Defendants to Plaintiff.
- 51. Further, Defendants' business practices can be classified as unfair on the additional grounds that the damage accruing to Plaintiff as a result of the defective LOAN significantly outweighs the reasons, justifications and motives of Defendants in executing and servicing the LOAN. Due to the LOAN, Plaintiff is burdened with a higher interest rate, a mortgage that did not pay off the debts (as Defendants promised it would) and the period of Plaintiff's mortgage is longer than it should be; in return, Defendants and each of them have unfairly and unlawfully received commissions, fees and payments from Plaintiff.
- 52. Finally, Defendants business practices were fraudulent because their activities were deceptive to the public. Among other things, Defendants represented to Plaintiff that very favorable loans, loan terms and interest rates were available, when in fact, they were not.

# **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### NEGLIGENT MISREPRESENTATION

53. Plaintiff incorporates by this reference each and every allegation contained in all foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth in full herein.

#### Count 1

#### (Against Defendant National City)

54. National City made material misrepresentations to Plaintiff which include, but are not limited to, those listed above.

#### Count 2

## (Against Defendant NC Service)

55. NC Service aided, abetted and was in a contractual relationship with National City and other investors as to downstream transactions regarding transfer and servicing of the LOAN.

#### Count 3

# (Against Defendants NC Service and DOES)

- 56. After the LOAN, was were deficient at the origination stage, was transferred to NC Service, NC Service initiated foreclosure proceedings against Plaintiff. NC Service made a misrepresentation of material fact by representing to Plaintiff that it had the authority and right to foreclose on the LOAN, when in fact, it did not.
- 57. Plaintiff received a Notice of Trustee's Sale from Cal-Western Reconveyance Corporation ("CWRC"). NC Service authorized CWRC to proceed with a Trustee's Sale on the Subject Property, which was to take place on or about February 17, 2009. By authorizing the Notice of Trustee's Sale, NC Service falsely and negligently represented to Plaintiff that it had the authority to foreclose on the LOAN.
- 58. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the representations of NC Service were false since NC Service knew or should have known that it did not have the authority or right to foreclose on the LOAN that was deficient at the origination stage.
- 59. If any of Defendants' misrepresentations made herein were not intentional, said misrepresentations were negligent. When Defendants made the representations alleged herein, they had no reasonable ground for believing them to be true.
  - 60. Defendants made these representations with the intention of inducing Plaintiff to act in

26

2.7

10

25

26

27

28

reliance on these representations in the manner hereafter alleged, or with the expectation that Plaintiff would so act.

- 61. Plaintiff, unaware of the complexities and/or defects involved in the subsequent transactions between Defendants that occurred after Plaintiff entered into the LOAN, justifiably relied on NC Service's representations that it had the authority to foreclose on the LOAN.
- 62. As a proximate result of the negligent misrepresentations of Defendants as herein alleged, Plaintiff sustained damages, including monetary loss, medical expenses, emotional distress, loss of employment, loss of credit, loss of opportunities, attorney fees and costs, and other damages to be determined at trial. As a proximate result of Defendants' breach of duty and all other actions as alleged herein, Plaintiff has suffered severe emotional distress, mental anguish, harm, humiliation, embarrassment, and mental and physical pain and anguish, all to Plaintiff's damage in an amount to be established at trial.

#### FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

#### **FRAUD**

- 63. Plaintiff incorporates by this reference each and every allegation contained in all foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth in full herein.
- Plaintiff is informed and believes that National City, NC Service and other Defendants 64. made various false misrepresentations to Plaintiff regarding the LOAN and induced Plaintiff to enter into the LOAN. NC Service assumed the responsibilities and duties owed to Plaintiff by purchasing/assuming the LOAN. National City, NC Service, and other Defendants are responsible for the false misrepresentations made by National City, NC Service, their predecessors and other Defendants herein. Defendants and each of them are successors in interest to National City, NC Service, to each other, and other responsible parties. All Defendants and each of them acted in concert with respect to defrauding Plaintiff.

#### Count 1

# (Against Defendant National City)

65. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants made various misrepresentations of material fact with respect to the LOAN, and induced Plaintiff to rely on said misrepresentations.

These misrepresentations were representations of material fact with respect to the period of the mortgages, the interest rates and other terms of the mortgages. The representations made to Plaintiff by Defendants were in fact false.

- 66. Plaintiff is informed and believes that all Defendants herein intended to induce Plaintiff's reliance on the facts misrepresented, and variously misinformed Plaintiff regarding the terms of the LOAN as alleged herein so that Plaintiff would enter into the financing agreements and so that they could cause Plaintiff to agree to the LOAN. National City, NC Service and other Defendants are successors in interest to Plaintiff's LOAN as alleged herein and each and all of them also intended to induce Plaintiff to accept the LOAN and to continue on with the fraudulent LOAN.
- 67. Defendants knew or should have known that the representations made in their correspondences were in violation of RESPA. Defendants knew or should have known that the representations made by Defendants in an attempt to convince Plaintiff to take out the LOAN were false.
- 68. In justifiable reliance on Defendants' and each of their various misrepresentations, Plaintiff did take out the LOAN on the Subject Property, Plaintiff is burdened with a higher interest rate, Plaintiff is burdened with a mortgage that did not pay off the debts as Defendants promised they would do, the period of Plaintiff's mortgage is longer than it should be, Plaintiff is now burdened with the unlawful LOAN and Plaintiff has suffered damages as a result.
- 69. At the time Defendants and their predecessors herein made the promises and representations to Plaintiff, Defendants and their predecessors herein had no intention of performing the promises.
- 70. The promises were made by Defendants and their predecessors with the intent to induce Plaintiff to take out the LOAN and take other actions so that Defendants and each of them could make their respective profits, commissions, yield spread premiums, sales quotas and gain other beneficial financial interests including but not limited to prepayment penalties, late payment penalties, surcharges and other fees.
- 71. Plaintiff, at the time these promises were made and at the time Plaintiff took the actions herein alleged, was ignorant of Defendants' secret intentions not to perform, ignorant of

Defendants' false representations stated herein, and Plaintiff could not, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, have discovered Defendants' secret intentions and false representations. In reliance on the promises of Defendants and their predecessors, Plaintiff signed various documents, ultimately ending up with the LOAN.

- 72. Defendants and their predecessors are reputable real estate companies doing business in California, and Plaintiff justifiably relied on their representations. Defendants and their predecessors are/were all real estate agents and other licensed professionals that worked for Defendants.
- 73. Plaintiff, at the time these representations were made by Defendants and their predecessors, and at the time Plaintiff took the actions herein alleged, was ignorant of the falsity of the misrepresentations and believed them to be true. In reliance on these representations, Plaintiff was induced to take out the LOAN, be burdened with fraudulent LOAN, and other actions. Had Plaintiff known the actual facts, Plaintiff would not have taken such action.
- 74. As a proximate result of the fraudulent conduct of Defendants as herein alleged, Plaintiff sustained damages, including monetary loss, medical expenses, emotional distress, loss of employment, loss of credit, loss of opportunities, attorney fees and costs, and other damages to be determined at trial. As a proximate result of Defendants' breach of duty and all other actions as alleged herein, Plaintiff has suffered severe emotional distress, mental anguish, harm, humiliation, embarrassment, and mental and physical pain and anguish, all to Plaintiff's damage in an amount to be established at trial.
- 75. The aforementioned conduct of Defendants was an intentional misrepresentation, deceit, or concealment of a material fact known to Defendants with the intention on the part of Defendants of thereby depriving Plaintiff of property or legal rights or otherwise causing injury, and was despicable conduct that subjected Plaintiff to a cruel and unjust hardship in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, so as to justify an award of exemplary and punitive damages, as well as attorney fees and costs.

#### Count 2

(Against Defendants NC Service and DOES)

- 76. Defendants made various representations of material fact with respect to the LOAN, and induced Plaintiff to rely on said misrepresentations.
- 77. After the LOAN was transferred to NC Service, it threatened and/or initiated foreclosure proceedings against Plaintiff.
  - 78. Defendants represented among other things that:
    - a. The LOAN was validly entered into and properly initiated free of unlawful or fraudulent inducements;
    - b. Defendants had proper authority to foreclose on the LOAN.
  - 79. The representations made to Plaintiff by Defendants were in fact false.
- 80. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants intended to induce Plaintiff's reliance on the facts misrepresented, and variously misinformed Plaintiff regarding the terms and validity of the LOAN as alleged herein.
- 81. Defendants knew or should have known that the representations made in its correspondences were in violation of state and federal law.
- 82. In justifiable reliance on Defendants' and each of their various misrepresentations, Plaintiff attempted to continue making payments on the LOAN, made payments or partial payments, spent substantial time attempting to contact and/or negotiate with Defendants as to possible modification and workout options, and endured the emotional hardship incident the threat of losing one's home.
- 83. Plaintiff, when confronted with the threat of foreclosure and at the time Plaintiff took the actions herein alleged, was ignorant of Defendants' inability to lawfully foreclose and its false representations stated herein. Plaintiff could not, in the exercise of reasonable diligence, have discovered Defendants' secret intentions and false representations. In reliance on the statements of Defendants and their predecessors, Plaintiff attempted to continue making payments on the LOAN to Plaintiff's detriment and Defendants' benefit.
- 84. At the time Defendants and their predecessors herein made the statements and representations to Plaintiff, Defendants and their predecessors could not lawfully perform; namely, Defendants lacked the legal authority to foreclose on the LOAN.

85. The promises were made by Defendants and their predecessors with the intent to make their respective profits, commissions, sales quotas and gain other beneficial financial interests including but not limited to prepayment penalties, late payment penalties, surcharges and other fees.

- 86. Defendants and their predecessors are reputable federally recognized financial companies doing business in California, and Plaintiff justifiably relied on their representations. Defendants and their predecessors are/were all financiers that worked for Defendants.
- 87. Plaintiff, at the time these representations were made by Defendants and their predecessors, and at the time Plaintiff took the actions herein alleged, was ignorant of the falsity of the misrepresentations and believed them to be true. In reliance on these representations, Plaintiff was induced to continue making payments on the LOAN and initiate negotiations as to a modification on the LOAN. Had Plaintiff known the actual facts, Plaintiff would not have taken such action.
- 88. As a proximate result of the fraudulent conduct of Defendants as herein alleged, Plaintiff sustained damages, including monetary loss, medical expenses, emotional distress, loss of employment, loss of credit, loss of opportunities, attorney fees and costs, and other damages to be determined at trial. As a proximate result of Defendants' breach of duty and all other actions as alleged herein, Plaintiff has suffered severe emotional distress, mental anguish, harm, humiliation, embarrassment, and mental and physical pain and anguish, all to Plaintiff's damage in an amount to be established at trial.
- 89. The aforementioned conduct of Defendants was an intentional misrepresentation, deceit, or concealment of a material fact known to Defendants with the intention on the part of Defendants of thereby depriving Plaintiff of property or legal rights or otherwise causing injury, and was despicable conduct that subjected Plaintiff to a cruel and unjust hardship in conscious disregard of Plaintiff's rights, so as to justify an award of exemplary and punitive damages, as well as attorney fees and costs.

## SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

#### RESCISSION

90. Plaintiff incorporates by this reference each and every allegation contained in all foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth in full herein.

- 91. Plaintiff is entitled to rescind the LOAN because the note and contract were defectively and/or fraudulently consummated in violation of applicable laws.
- 92. Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants do not have and cannot produce an original deed and an original note relating to the LOAN.
- 93. Plaintiff had a continuing right to rescind the transaction until the third business day after receiving both a proper and accurate cancellation rights notice and all "material" disclosures described in the preceding paragraph, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1635(a) and Regulation Z § 226.23(a)(3), up to three years after consummation of the transaction.
- 94. Based on the violations of Defendants of 15 U.S.C. § 1635, Plaintiff suffered actual damages in an amount exceeding the jurisdictional minimum of this Court and to be determined at trial in the form of prepaid interest and charges delivered to and additional damages in the form of payments, interest, fees, and charges paid by Plaintiff on the LOAN. Plaintiff is entitled to additional relief under 15 U.S.C. § 1640 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1635(g).
- 95. As a proximate result of the conduct of Defendants as herein alleged, Plaintiff sustained damages, including monetary loss, medical expenses, emotional distress, loss of employment, loss of credit, loss of opportunities, attorney fees and costs, and other damages to be determined at trial. As a proximate result of Defendants' breach of duty and all other actions as alleged herein, Plaintiff has suffered severe emotional distress, mental anguish, harm, humiliation, embarrassment, and mental and physical pain and anguish, all to Plaintiff's damage in an amount to be established at trial.

# SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

# **QUASI CONTRACT**

- 96. Plaintiff incorporates by this reference each and every allegation contained in all foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth in full herein.
- 97. Plaintiff is informed and believes that a contractual relationship exists between Plaintiff and NC Service because rights and obligations under the Note between Plaintiff and National City have been transferred from National City to other currently unidentified investors, and then to NC Service. Plaintiff is informed and believes that the current investors claiming to own the

Note have entered into a contractual relationship with NC Service conveying rights and assigning responsibilities relating to the note and to Plaintiff.

- 98. Alternatively, if no contractual chain establishes that a contractual relationship exists between Plaintiff and NC Service, Plaintiff is informed and believes that a quasi-contractual relationship exists between Plaintiff and NC Service because, among other things, NC Service has demanded that Plaintiff make payments to NC Service on the Note and NC Service has stated and implied that Plaintiff has a contractual obligation to pay NC Service. Plaintiff has requested information regarding the terms of the arrangement between NC Service and the actual owners of the Note but NC Service has failed and refused to provide the information. Plaintiff will seek leave to amend this pleading when the relevant information is obtained in discovery.
- 99. All Defendants received benefits from Plaintiff in the form of commissions, rebates, portions of payment streams, fees, charges or other compensation deriving from the original defective loan documents.
- 100. Plaintiff is informed and believes that NC Service has received fees, costs, commissions, payments, and/or other money.
- 101. Plaintiff is informed and believes that NC Service has received fees, costs, commissions, payments, and/or other money which each Defendant has unjustly retained.
- 102. Plaintiff alleges that Plaintiff paid fees, costs, commissions, payments, and/or other money to Defendants under the mistaken belief that Plaintiffshewas under a duty to do so to Plaintiffsher detriment, and as a result of the payment of such funds Plaintiff has suffered financially.
- 103. By their misrepresentations, omissions and other wrongful acts alleged heretofore, Defendants, and each of them, were unjustly enriched at the expense of Plaintiff, and Plaintiff was unjustly deprived, and is entitled to restitution.

# **EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **DETERMINATION OF VALIDITY OF LIEN**

- 104. Plaintiff incorporates by this reference each and every allegation contained in all foregoing paragraphs, as though set forth in full herein.
  - 105. Plaintiff is informed and believes and alleges that the defective documentation, false

representations and/or fraud that induced Plaintiff to enter into the LOAN render the security interest invalid and unenforceable.

- 106. Plaintiff prays for a determination that the lien is void *ab initio*, and a declaratory order of the same.
  - 107. Defendants' claim to Subject Property is adverse to Plaintiff's.
- 108. Because of the wrongful acts alleged herein, Defendants, and each of them, have forfeited any and all interest in the Subject Property.

### **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for judgment against Defendants and each of them as follows:

- A. IF THIS COURT determines that Defendants violated TILA at the inception, then Plaintiff requests that this Court find that the alleged Note and Lien are invalid and order as follows:
  - 1. For immediate cease and desist order enjoining all Defendants, and each of them, their agents, servants, heirs, DBAs, FKAs, corporate affiliates, subsidiaries, employees, and all persons or entities acting under, in concert with, or on their behalf in any capacity from selling or conveying or attempting to sell or convey any interest whatsoever that Plaintiff may have in the real property commonly known as 28750 Canyon Road, Valley Center, CA 92082 or relating to the LOAN.
  - 2. For preliminary injunction and permanent injunction, enjoining all Defendants, and each of them, their agents, servants, heirs, DBAs, FKAs, corporate affiliates, subsidiaries, employees, and all persons or entities acting under, in concert with, or on their behalf in any capacity from selling or conveying or attempting to sell or convey any interest whatsoever that Plaintiff may have in the real property commonly known as 28750 Canyon Road, Valley Center, CA 92082, relating to the LOAN, which is presently unknown to Plaintiff;
  - 3. That the deed of trust securing the Subject Property and securing the LOAN, be rescinded and Plaintiff's Deed of Trust immediately restored to Plaintiff;
  - 4. That Plaintiff's credit standing be fully restored in relation to the LOAN;
  - 5. That any and all Notice of Intent to Foreclose issued by any Defendants or agents of

1			Defendants relating to 28750 Canyon Road, Valley Center, CA 92082 be rescinded;
2		6.	That title to the property commonly known as 28750 Canyon Road, Valley Center, CA
3			92082, be restored to Plaintiff in the name of "Annette Greetis"; and
4		7.	That the LOAN be forgiven in their entirety;
5	B.	IF TH	IIS COURT determines that Plaintiff has a right to properly rescind the LOAN, then
6	Plaint	iff reque	ests that this Court order:
7		8.	That Plaintiff's credit standing be fully restored in relation to the LOAN;
8		9.	That any and all Notice of Intent to Foreclose issued by any Defendants or agents of
9			Defendants relating to 28750 Canyon Road, Valley Center, CA 92082 be rescinded;
10		10.	That Defendants provide an accounting of all amounts charged to Plaintiff or paid by
11			Plaintiff relating to the LOAN;
12		11.	That Defendants promptly pay said amounts to Plaintiff;
13		12.	That the LOAN and related notes be forgiven in their entirety; and
14		13.	That Defendants receive and accept title to the Subject Property from Plaintiff.
15	C.	Under	all alternatives, Plaintiff prays:
16		14.	That this Court grant judgment in favor of Plaintiff against all Defendants;
17		15.	For all damages and remedies Plaintiff is entitled to recover under RESPA;
18		16.	For all damages and remedies Plaintiff is entitled to recover under TILA;
19		17.	For judgment that Plaintiff is entitled to compensation of the full value of the Subject
20			Property;
21		18.	For compensatory damages according to proof, including lost credit, lost earnings and
22			other employee benefits, medical expenses, emotional distress, humiliation, mental
23			anguish, and other compensatory damages;
24		19.	For general damages according to proof;
25		20.	For special damages according to proof;
26		21.	For interest on damages according to proof;
27		22.	For prejudgment interest on such damages as provided by law;
28		23.	For attorney fees incurred by Plaintiff;

- 24. For costs of suit incurred by Plaintiff; and
- 25. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

Dated: July 14, 2009

Quintana McConnin & Sarte LLP

By

L. Quintana, Esq.
Attorney for Plaintiff

Annette Greetis

[Fed Cmp r05 38016]

## **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANT	rs A.: M.		- 4		
ANETTE GREETIS				MATION	City Mort	gage oc	· Security	· han had	
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) OF THE LOCATION OF GIMER T LAND INVOLVED.					
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name	e, Address, and Telephone Number)			Attorneys (If Know		űγ:		M	
L. Quiintana, Esq.	· ·	: (619) 231-6655		Thiomeye (ii idio)	··· <i>,</i>			DEPUTY	
450 B Street, Suite 143								1 /	
II. BASIS OF JURISI			III. CI	TIZENSHIP O		AL PARTIE		n One Box for Plaint ( for Defendant)	
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff □ 2 U.S. Government	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government No	ot a Party)	Citize	(For Diversity Cases On en of This State 09 CV en of Another State	1501	Incorporated or of Burgless III	Principal Place	PTF DEF	
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship	of Parties in Item III)					n Another State		
				en or Subject of a reign Country	□ 3 □ 3	Foreign Nation		06 06	
IV. NATURE OF SUI			ą.					ķ	
□ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	S PERSONAL INJURY		ORFEITURE/PENALT  0 Agriculture		NKRUPTCY HERE eal 28 USC 158		Reapportionment	
☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment Æ Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	310 Airplane	3 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice 3 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 3 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERT 3 370 Other Fraud 3 371 Truth in Lending	62	0 Other Food & Drug 5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 8 0 Liquor Laws 0 R.R. & Truck 0 Airline Regs. 0 Occupational Safety/Health 0 Other	81   223 Wit 28 U	hdrawal USC 157  RTY RIGHTS (66) Strip Rights (6	410 Antit   430 Bank   440 Deppe   460 Deppe   470 Rack   Corn.   480 Cons   490 Cable   810 Select   850 Security   850 Security   650 Sec	rust s and Banking merce station eteer Influenced and upt Organizations umer Credit e/Sat TV titive Service rities/Commodities/	
of Veteran's Benefits  160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise 196 Franchise 197 Product Liability 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	□ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal Injury  □ 341 Voting □ 442 Voting □ 443 Housing/ Accommodations □ 444 Welfare □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - □ Employment		□ 72 □ 73 NS區 □ 74 □ 79 □ 79 □ 79	0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Mgmt. Relation 0 Labor/Mgmt. Reportin & Disclosure Act 0 Railway Labor Act 0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act 2 Naturalization Applic 3 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee 5 Other Immigration Actions	862 Blac   863 Blac   864 SV   864 SV   865 RS   865 RS   867 Tax   67 Tax   871 TRS   26 U	ck Lung (923) VC/DIWW (405(g)) D Title XVI	875 Custo   12 US   890 Other   891 Agric   892 Econ   893 Envi   894 Energ   895 Freec   Act   900Appet   Unde to Jus   950 Cons	schange ustomer Challenge 2 USC 3410 ther Statutory Actions gricultural Acts conomic Stabilization Act invironmental Matters nergy Allocation Act reedom of Information ct opeal of Fee Determination nder Equal Access Justice onstitutionality of tate Statutes	
<b>□</b> 2 R	tate Court A	ppellate Court	Reor	pened ar	ransferred from nother district specify)	Litigati	on	Appeal to Distri Judge from Magistrate Judgment	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	ON Cite the U.S. Civil State 15 U.S.C. 1601;  Brief description of cau Consumer mortg	se:				uniess diversity	<b></b>		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:		S A CLASS ACTION		EMAND \$		CHECK YES on	•		
VIII. RELATED CAS	SE(S) (See instructions)	UDGE	,			ET NUMBER			
DATE 07/14/2009	•	SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY	OF RECORD					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # 1989	AMOUNT (S)	APPLYING IFP		JUDO	GE	MAG. J	IUDGE		
5/11/10	)9					<del></del>			

· Court Name: USDC California Southern

Division: 3

Receipt Number: CASO02989 Cashier ID: sramirez

Transaction Date: 07/14/2009 Payer Name: QUINTANA LLP

CIVIL FILING FEE

For: GRETTIS V. NC MORTGAGE

Case/Party: D-CAS-3-09-CV-001502-001

Amount:

\$350.00

CHECK

Check/Money Order Num: 1009 Amt Tendered: \$350.00

Total Due:

\$350.00 Total Tendered: \$350.00

Change Amt:

\$0.00

There will be a fee of \$45.00 charged for any returned check.